

REMARKS

Reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims, in view of the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4 and 6-8, as amended, are presently pending. Claim 8 is new. Claims 2-4, 6 and 7 have been amended to further define the subject matter of applicant's claimed invention. Claims 2 and 3 have been amended to include the copolymerized structure recited in claim 7. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, including page 13, lines 19-22 and page 20, line 24-page 21, line 1. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 2-6 and 6-8 are presented for examination, of which claims 2, 3, 7 and 8 are independent.

Prior Art Rejections:

Claim 2 positively recites, *inter alia*, an organic/inorganic composite material made of a copolymerized structure, in which a monomer or an oligomer formed of organic backbones and a monomer or oligomer having inorganic element are copolymerized.

The Office Action admits that Kohara fails to disclose the composite materials recited in amended claim 2.

Itoi does not supply what is missing in Kohara. Itoi discloses that "the present invention relates to a manufacturing method for forming a hard plastic lens by casting diethylene glycol bisallyl carbonate which is molded by heating to effect polymerization. More specifically, a polymerization initiator, an organic peroxide type crosslinking agent, a silane coupling agent, and an inorganic fine powder are added to diethyleneglycolbisallyl carbonate, and such mixture is heated to effect polymerization" (Itoi page 1, lines 4-10). As described above, Itoi discloses that the inorganic fine powder is added, followed by stirring and mixing only. Thus, Itoi does not disclose an organic/inorganic composite material made of a copolymerized structure, in which a monomer or an oligomer formed of organic backbones and a monomer or oligomer having inorganic element are copolymerized, as recited by applicant's claim 2.

Claim 7, which depends upon claim 2, is allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 2. Claim 7, *inter alia*, recites a composite structure having a curing agent that is cured by an ultraviolet ray. Kohara discloses that thermoplastic resin is used for the lens. Thermoplastic resin, as the name connotes, is resin that is cured by heat, not

ultraviolet radiation. In addition, Kohara discloses that the lens is molded by heat only (Kohara, col. 24, line 57 to col. 25, line 15). Kohara does disclose that UV curing type resin is used for coating (Kohara, col. 24, lines 51-56). However, this is merely one example of the protective film on the reflector, not the lens itself. Thus, Kohara does not disclose a composite structure having a curing agent that is cured by an ultraviolet ray, as recited by applicant in claim 7. In addition, Itoi also discloses thermal polymerization only to obtain the plastic lens. Therefore, Itoi does not disclose a composite structure having a curing agent that is cured by an ultraviolet ray, as recited by applicant in claim 7.

Thus, for all of the foregoing reasons, Kohara and Itoi fail to disclose all of the elements recited in applicant's claimed invention, thereby failing to make applicant's invention a predictable use of prior art elements. Further, Kohara and Itoi fail to provide a basis to establish obviousness under additional rationales, including simple substitution for one known element for another to obtain predictable results, use of known technique to improve similar devise in the same way, applying a known technique to a known device ready for improvement to yield predictable results, obvious to try, and the presence of a teaching, motivation, or suggestion. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal from this rejection, and allowance of claims 2 and 7 is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 2. Fujimoto does not supply what is missing in Kohara or Itoi. Fujimoto discloses an illumination system for a microscope, but not an organic/inorganic composite material made of a copolymerized structure, in which a monomer or an oligomer formed of organic backbones and a monomer or oligomer having inorganic element are copolymerized, as recited by applicant's claim 2.

Thus, for all of the foregoing reasons, Kohara, Itoi and Fujimoto fail to disclose all of the elements recited in applicant's claimed invention, thereby failing to make applicant's invention a predictable use of prior art elements. Further, Kohara, Itoi and Fujimoto fail to provide a basis to establish obviousness under additional rationales, including simple substitution for one known element for another to obtain predictable results, use of known technique to improve similar devise in the same way, applying a known technique to a known device ready for improvement to yield predictable results, obvious to try, and the presence of a teaching, motivation, or

suggestion. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal from this rejection, and allowance of claim 6 is respectfully requested.

Claim 3 positively recites, *inter alia*, an organic/inorganic composite material made of a copolymerized structure, in which a monomer or an oligomer formed of organic backbones and a monomer or oligomer having inorganic element are copolymerized.

The Office Action admits that Kohara fails to disclose the composite materials recited in amended claim 3.

Fukuzawa does not supply what is missing in Kohara. Fukuzawa discloses a composite material having an inorganic and an organic material, but not an organic/inorganic composite material made of a copolymerized structure, in which a monomer or an oligomer formed of organic backbones and a monomer or oligomer having inorganic element are copolymerized, as recited by applicant's claim 3.

Thus, for all of the foregoing reasons, Kohara and Fukuzawa fail to disclose all of the elements recited in applicant's claimed invention, thereby failing to make applicant's invention a predictable use of prior art elements. Further, Kohara and Fukuzawa fail to provide a basis to establish obviousness under additional rationales, including simple substitution for one known element for another to obtain predictable results, use of known technique to improve similar devise in the same way, applying a known technique to a known device ready for improvement to yield predictable results, obvious to try, and the presence of a teaching, motivation, or suggestion. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal from this rejection, and allowance of claims 3 and 4 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion:

All matters having been addressed and in view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the immediate allowance of all pending claims.

Applicant's representative remains ready to assist the Examiner in any way to facilitate and expedite the prosecution of this matter. If any point remains in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP
SHAW PITTMAN LLP

By: 
T.Y. Winarski
Reg. No. 41, 381
Tel. No. 703.770.7948
Fax No. 703.770.7901

Date: November 6, 2007
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 770-7900